

REMARKS

## I. INTRODUCTION

In response to the Office Action dated January 15, 2003, and in conjunction with the continued prosecution application (CPA) submitted herewith, no claims have been cancelled, amended or amended. Claims 1-117 remain in the application. Entry of these amendments, and re-consideration of the application, is requested.

## II. PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

In paragraphs (3)-(4) of the Office Action, claims 1, 13, 14, 16, 17, 21, 22, 40, 52, 53, 55, 56, 60, 61, 79, 91, 92, 94, 95, 99, and 100 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Crichton et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,104,716 (Crichton). In paragraphs (5)-(6) of the Office Action, claims 3-11, 42-50, and 81-89 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Crichton. In paragraph (7) of the Office Action, claims 2, 28-39, 41, 67-78, 80, and 106-117 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Crichton in view of Fox et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,421,781 B1 (Fox). In paragraph (8) of the Office Action, claims 12, 51, and 90 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Crichton in view of Griffiths et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,286,045 (Griffiths). In paragraph (9) of the Office Action, claims 15, 18-20, 23-25, 54, 57-59, 62-64, 93, 96-98, and 101-103 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Crichton in view of Coley et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,826,014 (Coley). In paragraph (10) of the Office Action, claims 26, 65, and 104 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Crichton in view of Raz, U.S. Patent No. 6,292,827 B1 (Raz). In paragraph (11) of the Office Action, claims 27, 66, and 105 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Crichton in view of Raz and further in view of Coley.

Applicants' attorney respectfully traverses these rejections. Applicants' attorney has amended independent claims 1, 40 and 79 to incorporate dependent claims 4, 43 and 82, respectively. As noted above dependent claims 4, 43 and 82 were rejected were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over 6,104,716 (Crichton).

With regard to U.S. Patent No. 6,104,716 (Crichton), Applicants' attorney invokes 35 U.S.C. §103(c) to eliminate this patent as a prior art reference, thereby eliminating all the rejections. In this regard, Applicants' attorney submits herewith a Statement of Common Ownership executed by Khanh Q. Tran, attorney for I.B.M. Corporation. Applicants' attorney asserts that this Statement is

sufficient evidence to establish common ownership of the present application and U.S. Patent No. 6,104,716 (Crichton) at the time the invention of the present application was made.

Thus, Applicants' attorney submits that independent claims 1, 40 and 79 are allowable over the cited references. Further, dependent claims 2-3, 5-39, 41-42, 44-78, 80-81 and 83-117 are submitted to be allowable over the cited references in the same manner, because they are dependent on independent claims 1, 40 and 79, respectively, and thus contain all the limitations of the independent claims. In addition, dependent claims 2-3, 5-39, 41-42, 44-78, 80-81 and 83-117 recite additional novel elements not shown by the cited references.

### III. CONCLUSION


In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner believe minor matters still remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

GATES & COOPER LLP  
Attorneys for Applicants

Howard Hughes Center  
6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1050  
Los Angeles, California 90045  
(310) 641-8797

Date: April 15, 2003

By:   
Name: George H. Gates  
Reg. No.: 33,500

GHG/sjm